



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

5. Arthur J. Roberts, in his paper, *Did Hroswitha Imitate Terence*, NOTES xvi, col. 478-481, may be correct. Yet his remark: "one cannot imagine any reason why the learned Celtes—poet of reputation as well as scholar—who discovered the manuscripts, should have manufactured them," leads me to suspect that he has not perused carefully Aschbach's study *Roswitha u. Conrad Celtes*. Originally printed in the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, 1867, lvi, pp. 3-62, it was printed in a second and enlarged edition in 1868. Now Aschbach tells us pretty plainly that the Roswitha dramas are a fabrication of the sixteenth century and supplies for Celtes quite adequate motives. Those scholars who, for example Creizenach, severely ignore Aschbach's investigations and cherish the myth of a Gandersheim dramatic literature in the tenth century, are believing something "too good to be true."

6. Cook, in his edition of the *Christ*, undertakes to explain *attres ord*, 768. In itself the phrase is not self explanatory, and is equally obscure in *Juliana* 471, where the Devil boasts:

misthelme forbrægd  
þurh attres ord eagna leoman  
swearþum scurum, etc., etc.

In *Riddles* lxi, 13, the word *ord* is puzzling:  
hu mec seaxes ord *ond* seo swiþre hond,  
eorles ingeþonc *ond* ord somod  
þingum ærþydan, etc., etc.

Why should *ord* be repeated so stupidly? Nor is the trouble remedied by Herzfeld's substitution of *ecg*; 'point' and 'edge' amount to the same thing in this connection. We can, however, improve all these passages by reading *oroð* 'breath' for *orod*, as in *Sol. Saturn*, 221,

ðurh attres oroð ingang rymað

7. Why do Kluge-Lutz, *English Etymology*, adhere to the impossible derivation of Mn.E. 'tight' from Icel. *þéttr*, M.E. *thight*. Even Bradley-Stratmann equates *tight* with *þiht*. One would like to know what other instances are found of initial *p* appearing as *t*. No; *þéttr*, *thight*=German *dicht*, whereas *tight* is the Scandinavian *titt*, adverbial neuter of *tíðr*, for example in the formula *hart ok titt*. The *gh* in English is mere spelling analogy, as in *delight*.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

## GERMAN LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Messrs. F. Schneider & Co. in Berlin have just issued the second (concluding) volume of their encyclopedic work, *Das deutsche Jahrhundert, in Einzelschriften* by a number of specialists, under the general editorship of George Stockhausen. These generously proportioned volumes, of some eight hundred pages each, offer a comprehensive account of the aims and achievements of the Germans during the nineteenth century, grouped under the successive heads of literature, art, philosophy, economics, jurisprudence, history, music, military and naval science, and the several departments of natural science. The work is a small library in itself—or rather, a library of historical treatises, supplemented by the data of a *Grundriss*, for the reader finds at the foot of each page statistical information about all important personages mentioned in the text, together with references to biographical and critical literature.

The first section, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (pp. 160), is by Dr. Carl Busse of Berlin, who is himself favorably known as a poet and story-writer of the younger generation, and this section, like the others, is obtainable separately (br. M. 3.—geb. M. 4.—). I am acquainted with no more suitable *vade mecum* for students of contemporary German literature. Dr. Busse gives a bird's-eye view of the whole period from the last years of Schiller's life to the present time, in a series of necessarily brief, but precise, clear, and illuminating characterizations. This is a handy book of reference, but not merely that. The writer is not a mere compiler of statistics, nor yet a juggler with epigrams. He presents a narrative, properly proportioned and skilfully arranged, which can be read with pleasure from beginning to end. He does not profess to make any new contributions to knowledge of the subjects that he treats. His point of view is that of an impartial and independent critic, who sees clearly, feels sympathetically, and sets down his thoughts or impressions with directness and sincerity.

W. G. HOWARD.

Harvard University.